



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,311	08/20/2004	Hiroshi Nishimura	13006.104	5421
7590 Fildes & Outland Suite 2 20916 Mack Avenue Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236			EXAMINER NERANGIS, VICKIE MARIE	
			ART UNIT 1796	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/13/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Attachment to Advisory Action

Applicant's response filed 8/2/2010 has been fully considered but is not persuasive.

Specifically, applicant argues (A) that the crystallization of Oya within a heating time of 5-30 seconds is only in association with orientation and not applicable to the vacuum, air pressure, vacuum air pressure, or press forming like claimed and (B) that previously claimed properties of crystallization index and absolute value of a heat-up crystallization heat amount are not disclosed by prior art and are the inherent results of the claimed process.

With respect to argument (A), the examiner agrees that the heating time of 5-30 seconds disclosed in col. 10, lines 10-16 is only in associated with orientation. Even so, Oya also teaches forming a sheet into an article with a forming time of 30 seconds (col. 20, lines 44-45). Therefore, Oya discloses a heating time like claimed even when forming is not associated with orientation. Furthermore, note applicant's own admission that a forming time of greater than 30 seconds is "industrially disadvantageous" (page 31, lines 5-7).

With respect to argument (B), it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., crystallization index and absolute value of a heat-up crystallization heat amount) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Furthermore, applicant has not established that said properties are inherently present in claimed method given that the examples are not reasonably representative of the scope of the claimed method.

vn

/Vickey Nerangis/
Examiner, Art Unit 1796